



Atty. Docket No.: 10050-102  
Appl. Ser. No.: 09/633,330

0-102  
3,330  
#5a  
2-18-04

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 9, 2004.

Jacob N. Erlich  
Reg. No. 24,338

Reg. No. 24,338

Reg. No. 24,338

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: H. John Caulfield Examiner: Virginia M. KIBLER  
Serial No: 09/633,330 Art Unit: 2623  
Filed: August 7, 2000 Confirmation No.: 3407  
For: A METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING PATTERN RECOGNITION  
SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

PERKINS, SMITH & COHEN, LLP  
One Beacon Street  
Boston, MA 02108  
(617) 854-4000

# RECEIVED

To: Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FEB 17 2004

## Technology Center 2600

**RESPONSE (A) TO OFFICE ACTION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.111**

Sir:

This amendment is being provided in response to the (non-final) Office Action dated October 8, 2003, for the above-captioned U.S. patent application. A petition for a one-month extension and the associated small entity fee are provided herewith. No additional fees are believed necessary for submission and consideration of this paper. In the event that additional extensions of time are necessary, such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required for consideration of this amendment are authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 03-2410, Order No. 10050-102.

The Abstract was objected to as exceeding 150 words. Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. Claims 3 and 7-15 were objected to as containing informalities requiring

correction. Claims 1, 3-4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico<sup>1</sup> in view of Lyon<sup>2</sup>. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Akiyama<sup>3</sup>. Claims 5-6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Straforini<sup>4</sup>. Claims 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon and Straforini in further view of Akiyama. Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Watanabe<sup>5</sup>. Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg<sup>6</sup> in view of Filipski<sup>7</sup>. Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Filipski and further in view of Watanabe.

Through the Amendments and the Remarks that follow, the objections to the Abstract and claims, and the rejections of claims 1-17 noted above are overcome. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,796,924 to Errico, *et al.*

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,903,884 to Lyon, *et al.*

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,602,938 to Akiyama, *et al.*

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,092,059 to Straforini, *et al.*

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,754,681 to Watanabe, *et al.*

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Patent No. 3,993,976 to Ginsburg, Arthur P.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Patent No. 4,975,975 to Filipski, Alan